DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 333 293 CG 023 448

AUTHOR White, Mark B.; And Others
TITLE A Comparison of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test.
PUB DATE Nov 90
NOTE 34p.; Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Conference on Family Relations (52nd, Seattle, WA, November 9-14, 1990).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adjustment (to Environment); Construct Validity; *Evaluation Methods; *Marital Satisfaction; Sex Differences; *Spouses; Test Reliability; Test Use; Test Validity
IDENTIFIERS *Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale; *Locke Wallace Marital Adjustment Scale

ABSTRACT

Past research has suggested that the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS) is a brief, reliable, and valid measure of marital satisfaction. This study was conducted to: (1) examine responses on the KMS from a national sample of couples; (2) assess the construct validity of the KMS through a comparison with the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (MAT); (3) compare husbands' and wives' responses to the KMS; (4) suggest tentative cut-off scores for the KMS that differentiate between distressed and nondistressed individuals; and (5) recommend the KMS as a brief, reliable, and valid alternative to the MAT for evaluating marital quality. A national sample of 115 couples completed both the KMS and the MAT. The KMS was found to be highly correlated with the MAT. Husbands tended to report greater marital satisfaction than did wives on the KMS, but not on the MAT. A tentative cut-off score distinguishing nondistressed from distressed individuals was suggested for the KMS. Finally, further support for using a brief, global evaluation of marital quality, such as the KMS, was provided. (Author/NB)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED333293

# A Comparison of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale and The Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test

Mark B. White*

Kansas State University

Robert F. Stahmann**

Brigham Young University

James L. Furrow*

Kansas State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

RUNNING HEAD: The KMS and the MAT

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mark B. White

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented at the annual conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Seattle, WA, November, 1990.

CG023448

*Department of Human Development and Family Studies, Justin Hall, Manhattan, KS 66506. **Marriage and Family Therapy, 274 Taylor Building, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT 84602. Partial funding for this study was obtained from the College of Family, Home, and Social Sciences, Brigham Young University.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## ABSTRACT

Past research has suggested that the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS) is a brief, reliable, and valid measure of marital satisfaction. In this study, a national sample of 115 couples completed both the KMS and the MAT. The KMS was found to be highly correlated with the MAT. Husbands tended to report greater marital satisfaction than did wives on the KMS, but not on the MAT. A tentative cut-off score distinguishing nondistressed from distressed individuals was suggested for the KMS. Finally, further support for using a brief, global evaluation of marital quality, such as the KMS, was provided.

# A COMPARISON OF THE KANSAS MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE AND THE LOCKE-WALLACE MARITAL ADJUSTMENT TEST

In his decade review of the literature on marital quality, Glenn (1990) identified two schools of marital quality, the "adjustment" school and the "individual feelings" school (p. 819). The former viewed marital quality as a characteristic of the marital relationship, while the latter defined marital quality as nothing more than married individuals' subjective evaluation of their marriage. Researchers aligned with the adjustment school tended to use measures of marital adjustment, such as the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test or the Dyadic Adjustment Scale, while those allied with the individual feelings school relied more on brief self-reports of marital satisfaction or happiness (Glenn, 1990). This distinction between schools is consistent with Sabatelli's (1988) assertion that most measures of marital quality can be classified as either measures of adjustment quality or measures of satisfaction quality. Measures of adjustment quality "combine the assessment of objective and subjective characteristics of marital relationships," while measures of satisfaction quality "assess only subjective evaluations of the marriage" (Sabatelli, 1988, p. 895).

Glenn (1990) further noted that the adjustment school appeared dominant in the early 1980s, but that during the 1980s a shift in emphasis began to favor the

individual feelings school. This change in focus is evident in the following statement by Fincham and Bradbury (1987):

> Because they contain both descriptive and evaluative items, current measures of marital quality are inconsistent with their interpretation as simply overall indices of sentiment toward the marriage. In our judgement the construct of marital quality is best limited to overall, evaluative judgments regarding the relationship (p. 800).

It is not clear, at present, if the majority of researchers in the field will be swayed by such arguments (Glenn, 1990).

One of the scales developed during the 1980s which does reflect the individual feelings school is the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (KMS). Consisting of only three items (see Appendix), the KMS was designed to be a parsimonious alternative to such longer measures as the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test, Dyadic Adjustment Scale, and Marital Satisfaction Inventory (Schumm et al., 1986). Space is often at a premium in family survey research and clinical assessment or research packages and the need existed for a brief, but valid, measure of marital quality. The theoretical design of the KMS incorporates the conceptual differences proposed by Spanier and Cole (1976) between satisfaction with spouse, with the marriage, and with the marital relationship (Schumm et al., 1985). According to Schumm et al. (1986), previous research with the KMS has generated some support

for the internal consistency reliability, test-retest reliability, construct validity, and criterion-related validity of the scale. The discriminant validity of the KMS has been demonstrated by comparing correlations between the KMS, the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS; Spanier, 1976), the Quality Marriage Index (QMI; Norton, 1983), and a variety of unrelated satisfaction items (Schumm et al., 1986). Research comparing the KMS with the DAS and the QMI has also provided support for the concurrent validity of the scale (Schumm et al., 1986). To date, however, research has not been published comparing the KMS and the Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test (MAT). As the MAT is one of the most widely used measures of marital quality (Cohen, 1985; Sabatelli, 1988), further information about the construct validity of the KMS could be provided by such a comparison.

The purpose of the present investigation was fivefold. The first objective was to examine responses on the KMS from a national sample as previously published research with the scale has been conducted only with samples selected from within the state of Kansas. If both the mean total score and mean response pattern were found to be similar to those reported in past research, the KMS should be useful for a variety of populations. The second objective was to assess the construct validity of the KMS through a comparison with the MAT. It was hypothesized that the two scales would be highly correlated. It was also assumed that the KMS could satisfactorily discriminate between couples classified as distressed and nondistressed

based on their MAT scores. The third objective was to compare husbands' and wives' responses to the KMS, as much of the previous research using the KMS has been done with wives (Grover, Paff-Bergen, Russell, & Schumm, 1984; Schumm et al., 1983a, 1983b, 1985, 1986). The fourth objective was to suggest tentative cut-off scores for the KMS which differentiate between distressed and nondistressed individuals. Cut-off scores for the KMS have yet to proposed. The KMS may have utility as a brief, crude screening instrument if satisfactory cut-off scores can be established. The fifth objective was to recommend the KMS as a brief, reliable and valid alternative to the MAT for evaluating marital quality.

## METHOD

### Sample

A computer generated random sample of 1104 married couples was selected from a national database of 15 million households. This sample was obtained from a prominent broker of names for direct mail efforts located in New York City. The database was created from census information, the telephone white pages, and vehicle registrations. The study was conducted in the spring of 1988.

The original sample consisted of 1104 couples. One hundred and four couples were eventually declared ineligible. Couples were declared ineligible if their address was erroneous or undeliverable, or if they returned blank or incomplete questionnaires. Subjects did so for three reasons, (a) one spouse was no longer

living, (b) the couple had divorced, or (c) some returned blank questionnaires with the comment that they did not desire to participate in the study. As is commonly done, the ineligible respondents were removed from the original sample (Bailey, 1982). This left a final sample of 1003 households, 154 of which returned the questionnaire. The return rate for this study was 15.4%. Due to missing or incomplete data, however, the final sample consisted of one hundred fifteen couples.

The average age for the husbands in the sample was 45.2 years of age, with a range from 23 to 82 years of age. The wives in the sample ranged from 20 to 83 years of age, with a mean age of 42.8 years. The mean length of the respondents' current marriage was 18.8 years, and ranged from 1 to 56 years. Nearly 80% of respondents had not been married previously. The respondents had an average of 2.1 children, with a range from zero to seven children. Ninety-two percent of the respondents were Caucasian, with Blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans and Asians accounting for the remaining eight percent. The respondent sample was well-educated. Over 33% of the husbands and 10% of the wives had begun or completed post-graduate degrees. Approximately 24% of both husbands and wives had a bachelor's degree, while 28% of husbands and 37% of wives reported attending some college. As for income, 64% reported that their annual total family income was $50,000 or greater. Because of the low response rate, the

representativeness of the respondent sample relative to that of the nonrespondent sample is unknown and cannot be determined.

Measurement

Respondents completed the MAT and KMS as part of a larger study. The three-item KMS was used with the original seven response categories (Schumm et al., 1986). The 15 item short-form of the MAT was the version used (Locke & Wallace, 1959).

## RESULTS

Scale Characteristics

Table 1 summarizes several characteristics of the two scales. The KMS means of 18.22 for husbands and 17.70 for wives are comparable to those reported in previous research with the KMS (Schumm et al., 1985; Schumm, Nichols, Schectman, & Grigsby, 1983; Schumm, Scanlon, Crow, Green, & Buckler, 1983). Consistent with past findings, responses to the KMS were negatively skewed and slightly platykurtic, which indicates that responses tended to be clustered in the satisfied end of the distribution (Mitchell, Newell, & Schumm, 1983; Schumm et al., 1983a, 1983b, 1986).

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

The mean total score of 117 on the MAT is within the range of previously reported scores on the MAT with nondistressed couples or with couples sampled from the general population (Crane, Allgood, Larson, & Griffin, 1990; Oltmanns, Broderick, & O'Leary, 1977). Responses to the MAT also tended to be somewhat negatively skewed and platykurtic, although somewhat less so than responses to the KMS.

The internal consistency reliability of the KMS received additional support as the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was .94 and .96, for husbands and wives, respectively. As previously published internal consistency reliability figures for the MAT have included either the split half alpha or Cronbach's alpha, both were computed. The Cronbach's alpha for the MAT (husbands = .69; wives = .72) was lower than the split-half alpha (.73 for husbands; .77 for wives) and both were lower than the .90 split-half alpha reported by Locke and Wallace (1959) and the .83 internal consistency alpha reported by Cross and Sharpley (1981). Carmines and Zeller (1979) have suggested a minimum alpha of .80. Thus the reliability of the MAT was adequate, but somewhat less than optimal for this sample, while the KMS demonstrated excellent reliability.

As the three KMS items are similarly worded, a oneway analysis of variance was conducted to determine if responses to the three items were significantly different from each other for both husbands and wives. Overall, the individual item

means for the KMS were significantly different, $F$ (2,228) = 15.39 ($p < .0001$) for husbands and $F$ (2,228) = 6.88 ($p < .002$) for wives. This finding suggests that responses to the KMS items are not simply responses to the same item repeated three times. When husbands' responses to the three items were compared with paired t-tests, the mean scores on the first and second items were both significantly greater than the mean score on the third item ($p < .001$), but were not significantly different from each other ($p < .21$).

A slightly different pattern occurred when the wives' responses were analyzed. The differences between the mean score on the first item and the mean score on the second and third items approached significance ($p < .06$ and $p < .10$, respectively), while the mean score on the second item was significantly greater than that on the third item ($p < .001$). Thus, although the mean response pattern was similar for both husbands and wives[1], with respondents reporting the greatest satisfaction with their spouse as a partner, followed by their satisfaction with the marriage and then satisfaction with their relationship with their spouse, not all of these differences were significant. This mean response pattern is also consistent with previously published KMS research (Schumm et al., 1986). As both the mean total score and mean response patterns from this national sample were similar to those reported in previous published research conducted with samples from Kansas, it appears that the KMS is useful for other similar samples, both national and

regional. Determining if this would indeed be the case was the first objective of this study.

Construct Validity Analysis

The second objective of the study was to provide support for the construct validity of the KMS. It was hypothesized that the KMS would be substantially correlated with the MAT. The correlations between the two scales are reported in Table 2. As was expected, the KMS was significantly and highly correlated with the MAT (.80 for husbands, .84 for wives).

Before the high correlation between the two measures can be considered support for the construct validity of the KMS, a competing hypothesis must be ruled out. The first item on the MAT is a global measure of marital happiness, while the remaining 14 items assess aspects of marital adjustment. As a result of the way in which the MAT is scored, the first item contributes up to 22% of the total MAT score. Although the MAT item wording is different ("Check the dot on the scale line below which best describes the degree of happiness, everything considered, of your present marriage") from the wording of the first KMS item ("How satisfied are you with your marriage"), it could be hypothesized that the high correlation between the two measures is due, in part, to the common methods variance between the KMS and the first MAT item. MAT scores were recalculated with item one removed in order to determine how much of the relationship between the KMS and MAT was

due to the contribution of item one on the MAT. The two instruments were then correlated. The original correlation dropped from .80 to .69 for husbands and from .84 to .75 for wives. As the square of the correlation between two variables is the percent of variance each explains in the other, squaring these correlation reveals that the KMS still explained 48% of the variance in MAT scores for husbands and 56% for wives. Thus removing item one from the MAT did reduce the correlation, yet the two measures remained significantly correlated. It should also be noted that the correlations between the first item on the MAT and the three KMS items were similar in range to that between the KMS and the MAT, minus the first item (correlations ranged from .66 to .71 for husbands and from .73 to .76 for wives). It therefore appears that the substantial correlation between the KMS and the MAT, despite the similarity between the first item on each instrument, provides support for the construct validity of the KMS.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

A further test of the validity of the KMS was conducted with a discriminant analysis. Traditionally, an MAT score of 100 has been used to differentiate between distressed and nondistressed couples (Jacobson, 1978; Locke & Wallace, 1959). Using a cut-off score of 100, the present sample was divided into two criterion

groups (distressed and nondistressed couples). The KMS was used to classify respondents into the two MAT criterion groups. Overall, 86.1% of both husbands and wives were correctly classified. The successful prediction by the KMS of the MAT group membership lends additional support to the construct validity of the KMS.

Comparing Husbands and Wives

The third objective of the study was to compare the responses of husbands and wives on the KMS. The difference between husbands' (18.22) and wives' (17.70) mean total KMS score was not significant ($t = 1.31$, $p < .19$). The same was true for responses to the MAT. As can be seen in Table 1, the mean MAT aggregate scores for husbands and wives were nearly identical (117.17 versus 117.50).

As a group, therefore, husbands and wives did not report significantly different levels of marital satisfaction on both the MAT and the KMS. Their mean response to the three KMS items followed the same pattern that wives' responses did. When the aggregate mean responses of husbands and wives were compared for each KMS item, husbands' scores on the three items were greater than wives' scores (see Table 1). However, none of these differences were significant, although the difference on item one (satisfaction with the marriage) did approach significance ($p < .09$).

T-tests were then conducted between husbands' and wives' responses at the couple level; that is respondents were matched and then compared on a couple by couple basis. Husbands' and wives' KMS score was significantly correlated for the couples ($r = .67$, $p < .001$). However, husbands' greater satisfaction score on the KMS was now significantly different than that of their wives ($t = 2.29$, $p < .02$). Husbands's scores on the three KMS items were also significantly greater than that of their wives on two of the three items. Husbands reported greater satisfaction with their marriage ($t = 2.97$, $p < .004$) and their partner as a spouse ($t = 2.22$, $p < .03$). The difference between husbands' and wives' satisfaction with their relationship with their spouse was not significant ($t = 1.03$, $p < .30$). Thus as group, husbands were not significantly more satisfied with their marriage than were their wives; but on a per couple basis, the average husband reported greater marital satisfaction than did his wife.

Computing a Cut-off Point

The fourth objective of the study was to suggest a potential cut-off point for the KMS which discriminates between distressed and nondistressed individuals. Following the procedure employed by Crane et al. (1990), a conversion formula was developed for translating a score on the MAT to the matching score on the KMS. The purpose for doing so was to calculate the equivalent score on the KMS when the MAT score was equal to the cut-off score of 100. This was accomplished by

running a multiple regression equation in which the MAT was used as the independent variable to predict scores on the KMS. The regression equation used to calculate the equivalency formula is as follows:

$$\underline{Y} = \underline{a} + \underline{b^{y}X}$$

where $\underline{a}$ represents the intercept, $\underline{b}^{y}$ the slope of the line, and $\underline{X}$ the score on either test (Crane et al., 1990). The equivalent score on the KMS, $\underline{Y}$, was calculated by multiplying the slope times the score on the MAT and adding the intercept. For both husbands and wives, a 100 on the MAT was equivalent to a 16 on the KMS.

Support for a KMS total score of 16 as a cut-off point may be provided by reviewing the response format of the KMS. The seven responses on the KMS range from extremely dissatisfied (1) to extremely satisfied (7). If a respondent marked somewhat satisfied (a score of 5) on an item it could be interpreted that he or she was experiencing some satisfaction as well as some dissatisfaction with the relationship (W. R. Schumm, personal communication, August 23, 1990). Therefore if a respondent's score averaged 5 on each of the three items, he or she would receive a total score of 15, the upper boundary of the distressed classification.

Using a KMS score of 16 as a cut-off score was also supported by a discriminant analysis. Respondents were classified into nondistressed and distressed criterion groups based on their KMS scores. Those that scored 16 and above were classified as nondistressed, while those that scored 15 and below were

classified as distressed. Total MAT scores were used to predict membership in the two KMS criterion groups. The global classification rate was moderately high, 80% for husbands and 85.2% for wives.

Table 3 contains the distribution of cases into the criterion groups across the two tests. The chi-squares are highly significant, suggesting that membership in the criterion groups across the two tests are very similar, but not identical. Overall, however, 86% of husbands and 88% of wives are in the same group on both tests.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

## DISCUSSION

The primary limitation of this study is the low response rate. It was hypothesized that this was due in part to the length and density of the total questionnaire. Because the demographics of the total sample were not known, virtually no information is known about the nonrespondents to the study. The results should therefore be interpreted with caution. As the respondent sample was predominantly older, white and middle to upper middle class, the results of this study are generalizable only to studies with similar demographic characteristics. However, the results obtained were similar to those obtained with Kansas samples of

various ages and socioeconomic status (Schectman, Bergen, Schumm, & Bugaighis, 1985; Schumm et al., 1983b).

The first purpose of the study was to examine the responses of a national sample on the KMS. Their responses were similar to those reported in Kansas samples both in terms of the mean total scores and the order of the individual item means, suggesting that the KMS may be a valid instrument for assessing marital satisfaction in other similar national or regional samples.

The second objective of this study was to demonstrate additional support for the construct validity of the KMS. That support was obtained. The KMS was highly correlated with the MAT and the KMS also satisfactorily classified respondents as distressed or nondistressed according to their MAT score, which suggests that the KMS is a valid measure of marital satisfaction.

The KMS also proved to be quite reliable with this sample. Again, however, responses to the KMS departed significantly from normality[2], which is consistent with previous research with the KMS (Schumm et al. 1983a, 1983b). It should be noted that the same was true of responses to the MAT. Sabatelli (1988) maintained that such problems plague all global measures of marital quality. It has been argued that negatively skewed marital satisfaction data is related to the increasing divorce rate (Glenn & Weaver, 1978). As more couples divorce, then those that remain married are likely to report high levels of marital satisfaction. The flaw in that

argument, according to Donohue and Ryder (1982), is that marital satisfaction scores, dating back to the work of Terman in the late 1930s, have always been skewed. Assuming this is true, then either the instruments developed to measure marital satisfaction are faulty, or the distribution of marital responses is negatively skewed for reasons other than the increased rate of divorce. In discussing the issue of skewness in another context, Norton (1983) noted that although data in certain contexts is skewed, researchers should not stop studying the phenomenon. Thus until this issue is resolved, one should not cease attempts to measure marital satisfaction.

The third objective of the study was to compare husbands' and wives' responses on the KMS. As a group, husbands reported slightly greater satisfaction than their wives on the KMS. Their mean responses to the three KMS items followed the same pattern as their wives. When compared on a couple by couple basis, however, husbands reported significantly greater satisfaction on the KMS than did their wives. It is not known, however, whether this difference in satisfaction reported by husbands and wives has an impact on the relationship of the average couple in the sample. In discussing psychotherapy outcome research, Jacobson (1985) has argued that differences between treatment and control groups must be shown to possess clinical relevance in addition to statistical significance. The application of this concept to the present investigation is that one cannot determine

if the difference of approximately half of a point on the KMS between husbands' and wives' mean scores suggests that the average husband is happier than his wife to the degree that it impacts their relationship or has real-life significance.

A fourth objective of the study was to suggest a tentative cut-off point for the KMS. For this sample, a score of 16 on the KMS was demonstrated to be equivalent to a score of 100 on the MAT. Much more research is needed, however, to support this preliminary finding. Future research demonstrating the utility of this cut-off point with varied samples for research, clinical and diagnostic purposes is recommended.

The fifth and final objective of the study was to recommend the KMS as a reliable, valid, and brief alternative to the MAT. As the two instruments were significantly correlated (.80 for husbands and .84 for wives), it is clear that they are assessing overlapping dimensions of the same domain. As the KMS consists of only three items, compared to 15 items on the MAT, it could be argued that the KMS is a superior measure on the grounds of parsimony.

An additional advantage of the KMS is its conceptual clarity. The MAT is designed to measure the concept of marital adjustment, while the KMS is a measure of marital satisfaction. Referring again to Sabatelli's (1988) classification of measures of marital quality referenced above, measures of adjustment quality combine assessments of objective and subjective characteristics of the marriage,

while measures of satisfaction quality assess only subjective evaluations of the marital relationship. The MAT is thus a measure of adjustment quality, while the KMS is a measure of satisfaction quality. In recent years, measures of adjustment quality, namely the MAT and the DAS, have been extensively criticized. Trost (1985) recommended that the concept of adjustment be abandoned as researchers have yet to clearly define, and therefore measure, the concept of adjustment. Others have argued that since global evaluations of the marriage are likely influenced by such variables as marital communication or conflict, measures of marital quality should not combine both in the same scale (Fincham & Bradbury, 1987; Sabatelli, 1988). In the present investigation, a factor analysis of the two scales produced one factor for the KMS and four for the MAT. Thus the KMS appears to measure a unitary concept, something the MAT does not.

The KMS, however, is not without limitations. Past research with the KMS has consistently reported negatively skewed responses and high correlations with measures of marital social desirability (Schumm et al., 1983a, 1985, 1986). The former finding was replicated in this study, while the latter was not tested.

If the shift towards the individual feelings school of marital quality continues into the 1990s, the need exists for a brief, but standardized, measure of marital quality. In light of the findings from the present study, the KMS is recommended as a valid and reliable candidate.

## REFERENCES

Bailey, Kenneth D. 1982. Methods of social research. New York: The Free Press.

Carmines, Edward G., and Zeller, Richard A. 1979. Reliability and validity assessment. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Cohen, Pennie. 1985. "Locke Marital Adjustment Scale and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale." The American Journal of Family Therapy 13:66-71.

Crane, D. Russell, Allgood, Scot M., Larson, Jeffry H., & Griffin, William. 1990. "Assessing marital quality with distressed and nondistressed couples: A comparison and equivalency table for three frequently used measures." Journal of Marriage and the Family 52: 87-93.

Cross, D. G., & Sharpley, C. F. (1981). "The Locke-Wallace Marital Adjustment Test reconsidered: Some psychometric findings as regards its reliability and factorial validity." Educational and Psychological Measurement 41: 1303-1306.

Donohue, Kevin C., & Ryder, Robert G. 1982. "A methodological note on marital satisfaction and social variables." Journal of Marriage and the Family 44: 743-747.

Fincham, Frank D., & Bradbury, Thomas N. 1987. "The assessment of marital quality: A reevaluation." Journal of Marriage and the Family 49: 797-809.

Glenn, Norval D. 1990. "Quantitative research on marital quality in the 1980s: A critical review." Journal of Marriage and the Family 52: 818-831.

Grover, Kelly J., Paff-Bergen, Lois A., Russell, Candyce S., & Schumm, Walter R. 1984. "The Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale: A further brief report." Psychological Reports 54: 629-630.

Jacobson, Neil S. 1978. "Specific and nonspecific factors in the effectiveness of a behavioral approach to the treatment of marital discord." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 46: 442-452.

Jacobson, Neil S. 1985. "Family therapy outcome research: Potential pitfalls and prospects." Journal of Marital and Family Therapy 11: 149-158.

Locke, Harvey J., & Wallace, Karl M. 1959. "Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity." Marriage and Family Living 21: 251-255.

Mitchell, Susan E., Newell, G. Kathleen, & Schumm, Walter R. 1983. "Test-retest reliability of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale." Psychological Reports 53: 545-546.

Norton, Robert. (1983). "Measuring marital quality: A critical look at the dependent variable." Journal of Marriage and the Family 45: 141-151.

Oltmanns, Thomas F., Broderick, Joan E., & O'Leary, K. Daniel 1977. "Marital adjustment and the efficacy of behavior therapy with children." Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology 45: 724-729.

Sabatelli, Ronald M. 1988. "Measurement issues in marital research: A review and critique of contemporary survey instruments." Journal of Marriage and the

Family 50: 891-915.

Schumm, Walter R., Anderson, Stephen A., Benigas, Jonathan E., McCutchen, Mary B., Griffin, Charles L., Morris, Janet E., & Race, Gary S. 1985. "Criterion-related validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale." Psychological Reports 53: 567-572.

Schumm, Walter R., Nichols, Constance W., Schectman, Karen L., & Grigsby, Cynthia C. 1983a. "Characteristics of responses to the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale by a sample of 84 married mothers." Psychological Reports 53: 567-572.

Schumm, Walter R., Paff-Bergen, Lois A., Hatch, Ruth C., Obiorah, Felix C., Copeland, Janette M., Meens, Lori D., & Bugaighis, Margaret A. 1986. "Concurrent and discriminant validity of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale." Journal of Marriage and the Family 48: 381-387.

Schumm, Walter R., Scanlon, Elaine D., Crow, Colleen L., Green, Donna M., & Buckler, Deborra L. 1983b. "Characteristics of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale in a sample of 79 married couples." Psychological Reports 53: 583-588.

Spanier, G. B. (1976). "Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage and similar dyads." Journal of Marriage and the Family 38: 15-28.

Spanier, Graham B., & Cole, Charles L. 1976. "Toward clarification and investigation of marital adjustment." International Journal of Sociology and the Family 6: 121-146.

Trost, Jan E. (1985). "Abandon adjustment." Journal of Marriage and the Family 47: 1072-1073.

# APPENDIX

## KANSAS MARITAL SATISFACTION SCALE

| Item | Extremely Dissatisfied | Very Dissatisfied | Somewhat Dissatisfied | Mixed | Somewhat Satisfied | Very Satisfied | Extremely Satisfied |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. How satisfied are you with your marriage? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 2. How satisfied are you with your partner as a spouse? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| 3. How satisfied are you with your relationship with your partner? | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Note: Permission is not required for use of the Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale for educational, program evaluation, or scientific purposes. However, Walter R. Schumm, one of the developers of the scale, would appreciate being informed of the use of the scale. Walter Schumm can be contacted at the same address given for the senior author.

## FOOTNOTES

1. As was reported in previous research with the KMS (Schumm et al., 1986), the response pattern of greatest satisfaction with spouse, followed by satisfaction with the marriage and then satisfaction with the relationship with the spouse was not consistent for all subjects. A significant degree of nonadditivity existed for both husbands $F$ (1,227) = 5.47 ($p < .02$) and wives $F$ (1,227) = 10.31 ($p < .002$). Thus this response pattern is for the total sample and cannot be generalized to each individual subject.

2. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was used to compare the response distribution to that of a normal distribution. The distributions for both the KMS and the MAT were significantly different than a normal distribution. For both husbands and wives, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) $z$ = 10.72 ($p < .001$) for the KMS. As for the MAT, the K-S $z$ was again equal to 10.72 for husbands and wives ($p < .001$).

Table 1. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE KMS AND MAT

| Scale | Mean | SD | Range | Skewness | Kurtosis | Alpha[a] |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Husbands** (N=115) | | | | | | |
| Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale | 18.22 | 2.86 | 9-21 | -1.06 | 0.62 | .94 |
| Satisfaction with Marriage | 6.12 | 0.99 | 3-7 | -1.34 | 1.80 | na[b] |
| Satisfaction with Partner as Spouse | 6.19 | 0.96 | 3-7 | -1.29 | 1.62 | na |
| Satisfaction with Relationship with Spouse | 5.90 | 1.07 | 3-7 | -1.00 | 0.59 | na |
| Marital Adjustment Test | 117.17 | 21.90 | 50-157 | -0.72 | 0.23 | .69 |
| **Wives** (N=115) | | | | | | |
| Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale | 17.70 | 3.07 | 7-21 | -1.24 | 1.52 | .96 |
| Satisfaction with Marriage | 5.90 | 1.04 | 2-7 | -1.23 | 1.74 | na |
| Satisfaction with Partner as Spouse | 5.99 | 1.00 | 3-7 | -1.15 | 1.19 | na |
| Satisfaction with Relationship with Spouse | 5.82 | 1.14 | 2-7 | -1.10 | 0.94 | na |
| Marital Adjustment Test | 117.50 | 23.04 | 53-158 | -0.64 | 0.12 | .72 |

[a] Cronbach

[b] Not applicable

Table 2. CORRELATIONS AMONG KMS AND MAT FOR HUSBANDS AND WIVES[a]

| Scale | (1) | (1a) | (1b) | (1c) | (2) |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Husbands** (N=115) | | | | | |
| Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (1) | -- | | | | |
| Satisfaction with Marriage (1a) | .90[b] | -- | | | |
| Satisfaction with Partner as Spouse (1b) | .83 | .82 | -- | | |
| Satisfaction with Relationship with Spouse (1c) | .89 | .89 | .80 | -- | |
| Marital Adjustment Test (2) | .80 | .77 | .71 | .78 | -- |
| **Wives** (N=115) | | | | | |
| Kansas Marital Satisfaction Scale (1) | -- | | | | |
| Satisfaction with Marriage (1a) | .91 | -- | | | |
| Satisfaction with Partner as Spouse (1b) | .91 | .87 | -- | | |
| Satisfaction with Relationship with Spouse (1c) | .94 | .90 | .91 | -- | |
| Marital Adjustment Test (2) | .84 | .81 | .80 | .81 | -- |

[a] Spearman rank-order correlations were computed but not reported as they were very similar to the Pearson's product-moment correlations.

[b] All correlations significant at $p < .001$.

Table 3. COMPARISON OF KMS AND MAT CRITERION GROUPS

| Test | MAT | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | Distressed | Nondistressed | Total |
| | | Husbands[a] | |
| KMS | | | |
| Distressed | 12 | | 20 |
| Nondistressed | 8 | 87 | 95 |
| Total | 20 | 95 | 115 |
| | | Wives[b] | |
| KMS | | | |
| Distressed | 16 | 7 | 23 |
| Nondistressed | 7 | 85 | 92 |
| Total | 23 | 92 | 115 |

[a] Chi-square = 27.11 (1, $p < .0001$)

[b] Chi-square = 40.36 (1, $p < .0001$)